## BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF,	)
	)
SHAM GAS EXPRESS, INC.,	) OTA NO. 21027198
	)
APPELLANT.	)
	)
	)

TRANSCRIPT OF ELECTRONIC PROCEEDINGS

State of California

Thursday, April 20, 2023

Reported by: ERNALYN M. ALONZO HEARING REPORTER

1	BEFORE THE OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	
5	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF, )
6	)
7	SHAM GAS EXPRESS, INC., ) OTA NO. 21027198
8	APPELLANT. )
9	,
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Transcript of Electronic Proceedings,
15	taken in the State of California, commencing
16	at 9:52 a.m. and concluding at 11:42 a.m. on
17	Thursday, April 20, 2023, reported by Ernalyn M.
18	Alonzo, Hearing Reporter, in and for the State
19	of California.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Panel Lead:	ALJ KEITH LONG
4	Panel Members:	ALJ ANDREW KWEE
5	raner menaere.	ALJ MICHAEL GEARY
6	For the Appellant:	PATRICK FINNEGAN DENNIS DUSKIN
7		ADEL JOUDI
8		
9 10	For the Respondent:	STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TAX AND FEE ADMINISTRATION
11		STEPHEN SMITH
12		RAVINDER SHARMA JASON PARKER
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

I					
1	<u>INDEX</u>				
2					
3	<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
4					1
5	(Appellant's Exhibits 1-16 were received at page 10)				
6	(Department's Exhibits A-D were received at page 9.)				
7					
8		PRES	ENTATION		
9					
10				<u>GE</u>	1
11	By Mr. Finngegan		1	2	
12	By Mr. Sharma		5	1	
13					
14					
15	APPELLANT'S WITNESSES:	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
16	Mr. Joudi	12		23, 30	
17	Mr. Duskin	16		28	
18					
19					
20	CLOSING STATEMENT				
21			PA	<u>.GE</u>	
22	By Mr. Finnegan		5	8	
23					
24					
25					

California; Thursday, April 20, 2023 9:52 a.m.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE LONG: We're opening the record in the Appeal of Sham Gas Express, Inc. OTA Case Number is 21027198. This matter is being held before the Office of Tax Appeals. Today's date is April 20th, 2023, and the time is approximately 9:30 a.m. This hearing is being convened electronically.

Today's hearing is being heard by a panel of three Administrative Law Judges. My name is Keith Long, and I will be the lead Administrative Law Judge. Judge Mike Geary and Judge Andrew Kwee are the other members of this tax appeal. All three judges will meet after the hearing and produce a written decision as equal participants. Although the lead judge will conduct the hearing, any judge on this panel may ask questions or otherwise participate to ensure that we have all the information needed to decide this appeal.

I'm sorry it looks like we just had someone join us. I'm seeing someone on the screen named Dennis.

Can you please identify yourself?

MR. FINNEGAN: Yeah. Dennis Duskin is the accountant for Mr. Joudi, and we've requested that -- he obviously might have had some technical difficulty getting

in, but he's on the list of individuals that we want to 1 2 have at the hearing. 3 JUDGE LONG: Yes, I do have him, and I see his 4 last name popped up. 5 Mr. Duskin, can I just verify with you that your 6 microphone works. Can you hear me? Mr. Duskin, are you 7 there? 8 MR. FINNEGAN: Judge Long, I'm going to text him 9 and ask him if he's on mute. 10 JUDGE LONG: Okay. Yeah. I can see that you --11 his microphone is muted. 12 MR. FINNEGAN: I just texted him and asked him if he was on mute, so hopefully that works. 13 14 JUDGE LONG: Okay. Looks like I'm not showing 15 mute icon anymore. Mr. Duskin, can you hear me? 16 Okay. Thank you. I just received a message from Mr. Duskin. 17 18 Mr. Duskin, we do ask that people generally don't 19 use the chat function within Webex. I understand that was 20 because you're having a microphone issue. Let's try and 2.1 work that out. 22 Ms. Alonzo, I think we're going to go off the 23 record again, and we're going to give Mr. Duskin a few 2.4 minutes here to try and figure out his microphone issue. 25 Okay. So with that, I'm going to be silent for a

1 few minutes. 2 (There is a pause in the proceedings.) 3 JUDGE LONG: Ms. Alonzo, let's go back on the record. 4 5 We're still on YouTube. Good. Good for us. All Okay. So where was I? 6 7 I'm going to start from the beginning of this paragraph again because I think otherwise it's super 8 9 awkward. 10 Today's hearing is being heard by a panel of 11 three Administrative Law Judges. My name is Keith Long, 12 and I will be the lead Administrative Law Judge. Judge Mike Geary and Judge Andre Kwee are the other members of 13 14 this tax appeals panel. All three judges will meet after 15 the hearing and produce a written decision as equal 16 participants. Although the lead judge will conduct the 17 hearing, any judge on this panel may ask questions or 18 otherwise participate to ensure that we have all the 19 information needed to decide this case. 20 For the record, will the parties please state 2.1 their names and who they represent, starting with the 22 representatives for CDTFA. 23 MR. SHARMA: Ravinder Sharma, Hearing 2.4 Representative for CDTFA.

7

MR. PARKER:

Jason Parker, Chief of Headquarters

1 Operations Bureau with CDTFA. 2 MR. SMITH: Stephen Smith, Tax Counsel for CDTFA. 3 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. This is Judge Long. And will everyone please 4 5 state their names for Appellant. 6 MR. FINNEGAN: This is for Mr. Joudi. My name is 7 Patrick Finnegan, CPA, representing Sham Express Mart. 8 MR. DUSKIN: This is Dennis Duskin. I'm the 9 prior accountant for the Express Mart, and I did his 10 bookkeeping for about 15 years. 11 Are you able to hear me. 12 JUDGE LONG: Yes, we can hear you. 13 MR. DUSKIN: Okay, very good. 14 JUDGE LONG: Mr. Joudi, can you just state your name for the record. 15 16 MR. JOUDI: I'm Adel Joudi. I'm the owner. 17 Represent me Mr. Patrick for this case. JUDGE LONG: 18 Thank you. 19 Okay. My understanding in this case is that we 20 have two witnesses, and they are Mr. Joudi and also 2.1 Mr. Duskin. Additionally, the exhibits for this appeal 22 consist of CDTFA Exhibits A through D. I do want to note 23 here that there were some defects with the hearing binder 2.4 that was distributed in March. Page numbering was 25 slightly off and also a portion of CDTFA Exhibit D was

missing. We redistributed the exhibit binder this morning with those pages that were missing.

2.1

2.4

In addition, I would like to point out that Exhibit D is a copy of CDTFA's Appeals Bureau decision, dated January 14th, 2021. And all of the parties have copies of this decision as evidenced by a partial copy that was included with Appellant's opening brief and a complete copy, which was included with CDTFA's reply brief.

At the prehearing conference, Appellant did not have any objections to CDTFA's exhibits. So taking all of that into consideration, OTA admits CDTFA's exhibits.

(Department's Exhibits A-D were received in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.)

In addition, Appellant submitted Exhibits 1 through 15 at the prehearing conference. CDTFA objected to exhibits pertaining to an audit other than the audit of Appellant's. However, OTA admits these documents over CDTFA's objection and will give Appellant's exhibits the appropriate weight.

Finally, after the March 28th, 2023, prehearing conference, Appellant submitted a statement from Mr. William DeZavala, an enrolled agent that was previously listed as a witness. My understanding is that the submission -- because Mr. DeZavala is unable to attend

today -- the submission was provided timely. And as noted 1 at the prehearing conference, I would like to offer CDTFA 2 3 the opportunity to respond to this statement. 4 Does CDTFA wish to provide a written response to this statement after the hearing? 5 6 MR. SHARMA: This is Ravinder Sharma. We 7 will address that in our presentation. Thank you. 8 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 9 And does CDTFA object to admission of this 10 statement as an exhibit? 11 MR. SHARMA: Yes. The Department would object to 12 the statement as not relevant to this case before the 13 Office of Tax Appeals. 14 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. As with your prior 15 objections, I'm going to admit this exhibit. However, OTA 16 will give this exhibit the appropriate weight and 17 consideration. Appellant's -- and going forward, this 18 will be known as Exhibit 16. Appellant's Exhibits 1 19 through 16 are admitted over CDTFA's objections. 20 (Appellant's Exhibits 1-16 were received 21 in evidence by the Administrative Law Judge.) 22 However, I would like to remind Appellant that 23 the issue here is the audit of Appellant's business. 2.4 while they may use their time as they please, it may be in 25 their best interest to tailor their attention to the case

at hand. The exhibits summarized above are admitted into the evidentiary record.

There's one issue in this appeal. It is whether any reduction to the measure of unreported taxable sales of gasoline is warranted. Today's hearing should be approximately 90 minutes, and that consists of opening statement and witness testimony by Appellant for 35 minutes. Before I allow Appellant to begin, I do need to swear in the witnesses.

Mr. Joudi and Mr. Duskin, can you please raise your hand.

## A. JOUDI,

produced as a witness, and having been first duly sworn by the Administrative Law Judge, was examined and testified as follows:

2.1

## D. DUSKIN,

produced as a witness, and having been first duly sworn by the Administrative Law Judge, was examined and testified as follows:

2.4

JUDGE LONG: Okay. Before we move forward with the opening presentation, does anyone have any additional questions?

1	Okay. Then Mr. Finnegan, you may begin when you
2	are ready.
3	MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you, Judge Long. Thank you
4	Judge Kwee, and thank you Judge Geary for being here
5	today. Is this just the opening statement, Judge Long, or
6	is this the entire presentation for me, please?
7	JUDGE LONG: This is the entire presentation,
8	including the witness testimony.
9	MR. FINNEGAN: Okay. Thank you so much.
10	
11	PRESENTATION
12	MR. FINNEGAN: Let me begin by identifying that
13	the audit took place from the period of July 2015 to
14	June 2018. Mr. Joudi, Adel Joudi is the owner of Express
15	Mart, located in Porterville, California. And Mr. Joudi
16	and I spoke yesterday, and I have a few questions we can
17	go over. I'll ask him these questions directly.
18	
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. FINNEGAN:
21	Q Mr. Joudi, thank you very much for being here
22	today. I greatly appreciate you joining us.
23	A You're welcome.
24	Q In 2015 something happened in Porterville that
25	effected your business greatly. In 2015 ARCO station, a

large gasoline company, was built on the Highway 65 north of Highway 190, one freeway stop from your business. Is that accurate?

A Yes, sir.

2.1

2.4

Q So let me talk about your business and how it was opened. When we spoke, you indicated that your business -- you purchased your business, and that business was closed for a year before you took it over. There was nobody operating that business. Can you talk about the prior two owners of that business, please?

A Yes. When I took over, the store was closed. The owners before me, they bought it two times. They closed it out. They couldn't make it. And I don't know about it. I'll be honest with you. After I bought it, they told me that. And I had run this store, and I trying to make this store.

To make this store working out, you have to be competitive with everybody else. And this way I had my way to do it, and I was the cheapest gas in town. Always. Even I -- part my friends and family. I lost them because of that, because I was always the cheapest gas in town, and they want -- they don't want me to do that because they have another gas stations, and they want -- they want me to raise my prices, but I couldn't do that.

I was afraid I'm not going to make it, and I'm

going to lose all my money. Whatever with I start this business, I put everything what I had. Like, if I lost this business it's going to be for zero.

And I'll be honest, about 10 years until I make it, 15 years until I make this business. Now it's doing well. Until I make this business, I had to do new margin in the gas in making people stop by at the store, at least making some money to survive the store inside the store. That's the only thing.

Q Thank you, Mr. Joudi. Really, what I take from that discussion that I had with you, is that it was critical for you to keep your gasoline prices low. You also have a mini-mart associated with your gasoline station. And your mini-mart sales actually has liquor sales, which is unusual in the State of California, but your business was grandfathered in that. You sell beer and wine. You sell cigarettes. You sell soda, and you also have nontaxable items.

Does -- so let me go through my notes on here.

Tulare County where you're located, you're located in the City of Porterville. I show on Exhibit 13 that Tulare County has the highest per-capita poverty level of any county in California. Were you aware of that, Mr. Joudi?

A Yes, sir.

2.4

Q In fact, Porterville has a high percentage of

individuals that are working in the farming industry, and it's sufficed to say that it's not an extremely affluent town? Is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. So you had indicated that you had been required to keep your prices low, and I'll go over this with the judges. In 2015 your financial statements, which are shown on the auditor's Schedule G -- 12G. It indicated \$3.819 million in taxable sales in the first year of the audit in 2015. However, in 2018, just a short three-year period afterwards, you had raised your taxable sales to \$6.118 million, roughly a 76 percent increase.

In 2015 you had paid taxes -- sales taxes to the State of California of \$277,000. Yet, by 2018 you had paid \$444,000, an increase of \$167,000 from the beginning of the audit. Were you aware of that, Mr. Joudi?

A Yes, sir.

2.1

2.4

Q Okay. Okay. Now, there's an important area that I noticed in social media that talks about your business, and I have that on Exhibit 13. And some of the items that were discussed are that:

Gus on Google stated, "And still the cheapest gasoline in town."

Google GF578 says, "Cheap gas as well."

Jeremiah says, "Cheap gas and good pricing."

1 Sheila says, "This gas station has the lowest prices in town." 2 3 And Vicky Painter on GasBuddy says: "I stop here for the low gas prices." 4 5 Now, you follow social media. It's important for 6 your business. You check these. Is that something that 7 you notice --Yes, sir. 8 Α 9 -- these -- okay. So it's important for you to 10 keep your gas prices low? 11 Α Low. 12 Okay. In 2015 through 2018, you utilized the services of Dennis Duskin and Associates to compute your 13 14 financial statements as well as your income taxes. 15 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. FINNEGAN: 18 Dennis, thank you very much for joining me today. 19 I appreciate you, and I appreciate you being able to talk 20 to the judges in this regard? 2.1 They're required to make a certain amount of 22 In fact, you know they couldn't operate if they 23 didn't make a good amount of profit. But because 2.4 Mr. Joudi has a convenience mart, he was able to maintain

his business on the convenience mart and was able to

sustain low gas prices.

2.4

Also, I do a lot of convenience marts and gas stations. I'm very familiar with the business. And something that happened early in the 2000s during the Gulf War and things of that -- in that time, as well as around this time the prices varied quite a bit. And I saw with a lot of my clients that their gasoline were -- they were losing money on the independent -- for the independent gasoline stores. And so that was very common.

And I didn't see that as a warning on this particular client. And we do double-entry accounting, and we keep an eye on accounts for any problems with cash flow or any indications that look like any underreporting and attempt to make the corrections if necessary. But didn't see any problem with the account. The cash flow seemed fine.

The client indicated he was losing money at times when he was selling gas, and I also didn't see that as a warning because I observed that on many other clients that I was doing the books and records for. So that seemed normal. He wasn't losing money in his business in its entirety because he has a store and was able to sustain those losses. And, eventually, as you know now, gas stations are doing very well.

So that's the way independent gas stations work.

They have periods where they make very little, sometimes actually lose money selling gas. And they have times where they make a very good profit. And the period that's being audited here was -- included a period where he was losing money, and that's really important to consider in this audit.

2.4

Q Thank you. Dennis, you had mentioned that the taxpayer was able to sustain that business based on his sales that he made in his retail store, really using gas prices to lure customers into the business. I took a look at taxable sales in 2015, and the taxpayer had a 28.845 percent markup factor for liquor, beer, cigarettes, soda. In 2016 it had grown to 38.35 percent over cost. In 2017 it was 36.84 percent?

And by 2018 his margins over cost for all of his taxable items were at 46 percent over his cost. Is that in your -- I mean, you've been in the business, I believe, 30-years plus. Can you describe those types of margins for a business and how it enables that to operate and be successful?

A Well, it's also -- it's all whatever the market will bear. I mean, any business will try to make as much money as possible. It's all about the competition. So I don't know particularly why those markups would have increased during that time, but I'm sure the competition

must have allowed that.

2.1

2.4

In the big picture, what really count is can he make a living on his business. He would have to -there's a point where he just couldn't make a living and couldn't drop the prices anymore, and he has to compete.

So I mean at some point, he would have to increase his markup in order to sustain his ability just to live on his business.

Q In the CDTFA's hearing reports, they indicate that the Department never received any purchase invoices for gasoline. I find that inaccurate because they also reconciled the gasoline purchases to the vendor information. Do you ever recall where the auditor, Auditor Lutz, ever contacted you indicating that he was lacking any accounting records that was needed. It certainly wasn't shown in the 414Z, which are the contacts between you and the auditor. Was there anything that you recall that he asked for and you said, "We don't have?"

A I don't have anything in my notes. And, again, this is a long time ago, so I don't recall that.

Although, it's possible I don't believe so, and I don't recall it. No.

Q Then can I tell you that in his working papers there was no contact with you. There was no emails provided to you. There was no indication that you hadn't

provided documents such as bank statements, purchase invoices, check ledgers, any of the necessary business verification documents?

2.4

A I don't recall any question about any of the documents being a problem at all. The only thing I really recall about this audit specifically is that he just didn't believe that the markup could be that low or go into a minus. And that triggered him using his own calculations. Just couldn't believe it could be that low, and so he began using the California averages.

And then he started then looking into, you know, more locally to try to come up with his own number because he just didn't think it could be possible that it was that low.

Q Let me clarify too to the judges. In 2015, the markup for gas was 9 percent over cost. In 2016 it was 6.3 percent over cost and 7.91 percent over cost in 2017. Dennis, you do a lot of these companies. Is that something to be concerned about? Are those what you feel are numbers that are sustainable?

A Again, I've seen the independent gasoline stations have a huge variance, from losing money up to 5 percent to making up to 20 or even 25 in some rare cases on the gas, depending on the fluctuation of the economy and the way things are going on in the world. So I've

seen this.

2.1

2.4

And like I said, during this particular period, I had lots of clients that actually were losing money on their gasoline and sustaining their businesses with their convenience stores. I did not have any independent gasoline stations that were trying to do this. They used — they had a name-brand and were able to survive the future purchases of their gasoline as they do, and they don't have to do the — you know, buy their gasoline at a spot price. They buy futures and just go on a continued markup.

That's generally what you will see with a Chevron or a Union 76. They just set their markup at, you know, 10 percent, and they purchase their gasoline futures and there's really no risk to them. But these small markets that are buying at spot price, it goes up and done.

Q One of the areas that I found fascinating to me as a CPA and as an ex -- I mean, I spent 20 years as an auditor with the CDTFA. In 2015, Mr. Joudi had gasoline sales of a little over \$3 million. By 2018 that amount had risen to \$5.23 million. Would you say that I -- seriously, that's not a pattern or practice of an individual that is committing tax avoidance.

Mr. -- or Dennis, is that -- I mean, that's a substantial growth in sales. Would you agree?

A It is. But I don't think that's necessarily an issue, only because somebody could start making a whole bunch of money. I mean, I don't know that -- you know, because -- it doesn't mean that he's suddenly showing more because he's being more honest. It's just the market was just doing much better at that time. Again, I don't see any indications of underreporting, you know, based on his cash flow. So, you know, that makes sense to me.

2.1

2.4

MR. FINNEGAN: Sure. One of the areas that I looked at, Judges, is what the market was doing during the period of the audit. And to be able to do so, I went to a GasBuddy, a company that tracks gasoline prices. Excuse me. And I did this for the period of 2015 all the way through -- excuse me -- through the end of the audit in 2018, and something very interesting happened. In July of 2015 prices dropped fairly substantially.

Let me get the file in front of me and take a quick look and walk you through that. It's -- it's this Exhibit 9 that's really critical. What happened in July of 2015, again, I indicated that prices dropped. The price dropped until about February of 2016. And this is a macroeconomics look at it, and it was done by Gas -- through GasBuddy. It's a 60-month average retail price chart.

And where I had to go to get this documentation

was GasBuddy. But I had to put in the nearest major metropolitan area in that, and that happened to be Fresno. Bakersfield wasn't there.

BY MR. FINNEGAN:

2.1

2.4

Q But, Mr. Joudi in Porterville is located half -- would you say halfway between Bakersfield and Fresno, Mr. Joudi, is where you're at?

A Yes. Yes.

Q Okay. If you see by -- in this chart, you'll see the prices begin increasing in February of 2016 and go all the way through, again, on a steady increase until about November of 2019 -- or '18. I apologize. And then what happens is in November of '18 prices drop dramatically. They go from in Fresno \$3.74 and they damn near get to about \$3 a gallon and oh, about \$0.75. And this is occurring in a time period between October and January and February of 2019.

Now, what happens during a drop in pricing -- and I provided the OTA with this analysis. It's something called a rocket and a feather that is common in gasoline. And Dennis can -- I'll ask you quickly about this after I explain it. And we're all gasoline consumers here, but what you see is prices go up very rapidly. And we've all lived through that. But what happens is when they decrease -- or I think they go down very slowly. They go

up quickly like a rocket and come back down as a feather.

2.1

2.4

What happened in October of 2018, that's a period when the auditor, Auditor Lutz, was conducting his shelf test and going to the business and looking at prices. So he begins on August 8th look at the prices. And this is in Schedule 8 if you want to go through this and come along with it. He goes through stores and he's checking prices and he sees that they're pretty stable until around October 2018.

I pulled up -- in getting prepared for this discussion, I looked at what the cause was for gasoline price and cost changes at the end of 2019. And what happened was there was an oversupply of gasoline, and there was concern about the U.S. economy going into a recession. Gasoline prices are subject to socioeconomic conditions, be at war, being international, being something with OPEC that are out of Mr. Joudi's control.

But what happens when prices fall rapidly is that profit is taken by gasoline stations. This is a perfect time to -- and what you've seen in my working papers is that was exactly what Mr. Joudi was doing. It went the entire audit, basically from 2000 -- early to 2016 through the audit period of 2018 in June of prices rising. The auditor comes in and tries to attempt to determine what his actual margins were in gasoline, and he picks a period

where they're having rapid income by Mr. Joudi.

2.4

This was not reflective of the period during the audit. It was an aberration at best. Yet, the CDTFA takes this income and believes that it's representative of all other periods. So I would caution CDTFA to say that the margin enjoyed during a period of rapidly decreasing cost is -- is valid for the entire audit period. So that is something I certainly want you to be aware of.

Let me keep going through my notes. Now,

Mr. Duskin also presented Mr. Joudi with a monthly

financial statement, statement of cash flow, balance

sheet, inventory, all of that based on Mr. Joudi's

preparation of a monthly sales summary. And the way

Mr. Joudi generated that document is every day he'd take

the sales summaries from his cash register and record them

on those sheets, and then he presented them to Mr. Duskin

who prepared financial statements.

Now, the CDTFA is going to tell you in their presentation that this wasn't sufficient, but I'd argue Mr. Lutz utilized these financial statements to look at taxable sales outside of gasoline, and he accepted those based on the margins that he saw utilizing the records that were prepared by Mr. Duskin. The only area that he questioned was on gasoline.

Now, we've spoken about the margins on taxable

items, other than gasoline being in the mid-30s.

Taxpayer's profit was generated substantially by the fuel -- or by the taxable items. But what you also noticed during the audit, if you look at the financial statements, the taxpayer's gross profit rises every year.

In 2015 it goes -- it was \$500,000. In 2016 it's \$533,000. In 2017, it's \$590,000. And by 2018, it's \$711,000. \$711,000 from 501. So he's increasing his gross profit in each and every year. Even above with gasoline, he's recognizing large profits.

2.1

2.4

In fact, in the 2018 period, he has roughly \$5.3 million in gasoline sales of -- and \$4.9 million in purchases, and this is shown on Exhibit 12, page 5 of 5. The spread between 5.3 and 4.9 is \$400,000. That's a lot of money for him bringing in on a gasoline business and CDTFA is attempting to impeach his gasoline sales, which I consider very problematic.

The other area that I would like to talk about is some areas that I found errors and omissions in the audit working papers. The Department has generated a document Schedule 12 A-1C, and that document is utilized by the Department to determine how much Mr. Joudi understated their sales throughout the document in front of me.

Mr. Joudi, when we talked today you indicated that you did not charge different prices for cash and

1 credit until you indicated June of 2018 when you bought 2 your -- you changed your dispensary on your gasoline. You 3 also purchased new pumps new software. You incorporated all those changes; is that correct? 4 5 Can you take yourself off mute, Mr. Joudi? Α Can you hear me. 6 7 Oh, now I can hear you. Go ahead and repeat 0 that? 8 9 Α Yes, sir. 10 Okay. So you never had any difference in prices 11 on cash and credit until you changed your pumps in June of 12 2018; that's correct, right? That's true. 13 Α 14 I'm looking at schedule 12A-1C. This is 15 Exhibit A, page 22 of 96 by the Department. Yet, if you 16 notice their working papers, they allocate 50 percent of 17 your sales being made through credit cards. That could 18 not have happened, right? And the entire period from 19 July 2015 to the last month of June 2018, your business 20 had no way to differentiate those prices; is that correct? 21 Α Yes, sir. 22 The other area that the Department has is 23 they're indicating again, 50 percent of your sales were by 2.4 credit card. But you have ACH where if a customer uses

their debt card, they're charged the same price as cash.

1 Is that accurate? 2 Yes, sir. 3 And that remains accurate to this day; correct? 0 Until now I still have it. 4 Α 5 It's still the same? Yeah. 0 6 Α It's still the same. 7 8 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. FINNEGAN: 10 What I find concerning though, is -- Dennis, did 11 the auditor in your recollection, did he ever ask you when 12 the change of cash and credit was done, in your recollection? 13 14 I don't believe he addressed the issue of the 15 credit card ratio and the gas in the audit at that time. 16 I don't think that came up until later when you were 17 working on it. 18 But another point that I wanted to make out or to 19 point out was that something else had happened in the 20 audit, was that he said the store sales looked fine. 21 inventory ratio markup, everything in the store looked 22 So he was being perfectly honest in the store but 23 just not being honest in his gasoline sales, and 2.4 everything looked great in the store.

So I thought that was a very important point as

well. And the auditor also, he never told me that any of the supporting documents were insufficient. I believe they were very sufficient, and he just never addressed that at all as being insufficient. He asked if he did have the cash register tapes, which he didn't have, but he never said that there was a problem with, you know, without presenting those. But --

2.4

Q Well, I'm looking at Schedule 12A-1C. And to be quite honest, I believe Auditor Lutz utilizes this documentation without any -- any work on it. He doesn't go any further. If the Judges could look at the schedule, there's a couple of things that really are concerning for me. He uses a percentage, again, of allocating credit card versus cash. That goes away. There was no credit card differentiation on retail sale prices.

So really the number, if the schedule is used, the entire amount of 28.28 would be utilized instead of 0.23. I'm not making the contention that this is accurate. The other area that he -- he doesn't do any work on is where he's calculating the weight of gas credit card price. When I took a look at purchases, I segregated them by unleaded as well as premium gasoline.

The auditor on every one of these documents I've seen on other audits that he's conducted uses 50 percent without any analysis on his part. He uses regular gas at

1 70 percent. He uses plus at 15 and supreme at 15. 2 looked at his overall purchase of gasoline. 3 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. FINNEGAN: Mr. Joudi, you buy 82 percent of your gasoline is 6 7 unleaded. Is that accurate? Yes, sir. 8 Α 9 To be able to go to 15 percent plus, it's 0 Okay. 10 bringing in unleaded as well as supreme gas. And to equal 11 15 percent, you'd have to use seven percent of regular and 12 7 percent of supreme to get to that percentage; right? 13 Yes, sir. Α 14 Seven-and-a-half percent? 0 15 Seven and a half. 16 Well, if he's -- if you're buying 82 percent and 17 you blend at 7 percent, your regular is going to be 18 75 percent, not 70. The auditor did no analysis 19 whatsoever. Is that accurate? 20 Yes, sir. Α 21 Okay. The other area that I want to bring in is 22 I asked Dennis Duskin, your accountant -- excuse me --23 that the auditor is indicating that 50 percent of your 2.4 sales are through credit cards. Again, this Porterville,

California. It's not an area of high credit card usage.

This is the salt of the Earth. These people are hardworking. They try not to run up their credit cards?

But what's interesting is we -- I had Dennis pull the 1099-Ks, which are the credit card receipts. And -- but within those -- that amount on the 1099-Ks is also ACH transactions -- debt card transactions. When we looked at that it was about 35 percent of your customers used their ACH, not credit cards. Is that accurate?

A Yes, sir.

2.4

Q Okay. So those are areas of the auditor's working papers that I was concerned about, and I'm going to wrap this discussion up.

One, you know, you're looking at a taxpayer that increased his reported amount substantially over the three years of the audit. Again, this is not the procedures of somebody that's looking for tax avoidance. He roughly increased his sales tax payments from 267 -- or 277 to 444. \$444,000, I mean, that's a lot of money to increase your sales tax. It's certainly not how somebody goes about avoiding taxation.

I do want to bring in one other fact. And I understand the short leash, Judge Long, that you're providing me to be able to discuss another audit. And I certainly appreciate Attorney Smith. I've been blessed to have worked with him in the past and gone through these

areas.

2.4

The one thing I wanted to point out is that the Department, the Fresno district conducted this audit at the same time as when Mr. Joudi was going through his audit, right. In fact, nine out of the ten times that they went to Mr. Joudi's store and took a test of his sales prices, they did the same at this business in Tulare County. In fact, it was the same auditor. It's a remarkable circumstance that I was able to compare two audits together. Okay. It doesn't happen like that.

In fact, the owner of the business provided me authorization to receive these documents because I had asked. Hey, the Department is telling me that the gas markup is insufficient for the area. I didn't know what that meant. Insufficient for what? What was the number? I've never seen any -- and the Department has never provided any analysis telling me what the average markup is in gasoline in Tulare County. I don't believe it exists.

I've asked numerous times, and you'll see that on my responses to the Department. Please tell me what's -- what does he have to do to get this through? And the company that was audited, they were kind enough to provide me with the working papers and the authorization. But what I found is when the comparison was going on pricing,

Mr. Joudi was on average \$0.10 less a gallon than what this other company that had been audited.

2.4

And, again, they were audited on the same day nine out of ten times. So there was a -- that's why I believe it was a valid review. When I looked at 2015 for this other company, I brought them all into tax included. So I'm looking apples to apples. They are the same functional number. And the taxpayer -- the other taxpayer in Tulare, his margins were 13 percent over cost in 2015. Mr. Joudi's was, I believe, 9.6. A difference of three-and-a-half percent.

For 2016, the other entity had markups of around 9. Mr. Joudi was 6.36. And in 2017, I believe the other entity was 11. Mr. Joudi was 7.91. The differences between those two margins were roughly 3.17 or 3 percent. Somewhere around there. The other businesses were always 3 percent higher than Mr. Joudi. But what I found is then the auditor in his analysis of what the retail sales prices were, Mr. Joudi was \$0.10 on a cost of a little over \$3 a gallon. That roughly equals to that 3 percent difference that we've seen in the difference between the two entities.

Now, CDTFA accepted the higher margins by this other entity. So my thought was, is what does my client have to -- what are his numbers that they have to be for

CDTFA to say, yeah, that looks good? Well, the Department knew. The supervisor knew that you had two competing businesses being audited at the same time with the same arguments saying, hey, our records are accurate. And I appreciate the fact.

2.4

I'm not going to indicate what the other business was or question why the Department of the Fresno district chose one over the other by assessing a liability. What I'm saying is their consistency has to happen. What happened in this audit is that the Department is indicating that my client owes an additional \$1,070,000 of additional taxable measure for unreported gasoline.

Now, where that really hits us is let's say that's \$300,000 every year. What the Judges have to understand is CDTFA reports this difference to the Franchise Tax Board as additional gross receipts. That information gets passed along to the IRS as well. For the Department to hand out these determinations like candy without any solid financial background or analysis is a detriment.

Mr. Joudi would have had to pay tax -- additional income tax at, let's say, 20 percent over \$300,000. Each year he would have an additional \$60,000 of federal income tax as well as the Franchise Tax Board additional tax.

Had he just rolled over and said yes, I owe this

\$1,070,000 times the sales tax rate. This is what I am now stuck with. This is the results of this, and we find that very concerning.

2.4

I'm going to summarize this as best I can. I know some of the contentions that I've made I'll repeat.

Mr. Joudi does not have to sell at a specific tax rate.

That's not a requirement from the State of California.

They can't dictate what his sale prices are. They will ask is this a reasonable assessment? Is this a reasonable amount of margin? And in this point, absolutely yes.

He's growing his business. Every year his profit margins are up. Every year he's paying additional taxes. This is not the practice of somebody committing tax avoidance.

I appreciate the opportunity of discussing this.

I'm obviously passionate about this. I was an auditor for

20 years, and I don't like to see a taxpayer that is -
I've lived this case since 2019, and I'm prepared to

answer anything that you have.

MR. DUSKIN: Can I make a few comments before you finish, sir?

MR. FINNEGAN: Yeah. Thanks, Dennis.

MR. DUSKIN: As far as the supporting documents, there's no problem with the supporting documents in this audit. There's no complaints about the supporting documents. There's no -- also, there was no problem with

the cash flow. There's no indication of additional money being deposited in the bank that was not accounted for.

There was no indication of additional cash that wasn't being accounted for.

Also, as his tax preparer, I didn't see any indication of excess lifestyle living or anything in excess showing that he was making a lot of money. It looked like he was actually having a very hard time back in that time. So I think this audit is really coming down to the State Board just couldn't believe -- that the auditor just couldn't believe that the markup was that low.

He just couldn't believe it was that low because he saw, I think one month or a period when it went into a minus. And he just couldn't believe it was that low, and it just kind of kicked the whole thing off. The store was fine. The markup in the store was fine. Everything looked fine. It really is just coming down to he can't believe the markup was that low, and I do believe, in fact, it was so. And I saw that with many other clients in that period of time.

That's all.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE LONG: Okay. Thank you. At this time -I'm sorry. At this time, I want to turn to my
co-Panelists to see if they have any questions.

Judge Geary, do you have any questions? 1 JUDGE GEARY: I believe I do. 2 3 Mr. Duskin, can you hear me okay? MR. DUSKIN: 4 I can. 5 JUDGE GEARY: You said you were the Appellant's tax preparer. But earlier I think the indication from 6 7 Mr. Finnegan was that you did his income taxes. Did you also do his sales and use tax returns? 8 MR. DUSKIN: Yes. 10 JUDGE GEARY: And did you base your -- the 11 information that you put on those returns on the summary 12 that Mr. Joudi gave you? 13 MR. DUSKIN: That's correct. He also --14 JUDGE GEARY: Did you ever see -- go ahead. 15 MR. DUSKIN: We also have an analysis that we do 16 on all of our clients on the cash flow. If we ever 17 observe more money going into the bank then -- or we have 18 several indicators keeping an eye on our accounts that 19 would indicate underreported sales. We didn't have any 20 trouble with this account. His records seem to match. 21 JUDGE GEARY: Okay. You mentioned that you would 22 look at money going into accounts. Could you tell me what 23 other factors that your business would look at? 2.4 MR. DUSKIN: Yes. So we look at, if they buy 25 more than they sell, that would be an indication of

1 unreported sales. If they don't buy enough, there would 2 be an underreporting of purchases, which is also a warning 3 for the State Board. I mean, if they are underreporting purchases, maybe they are underreporting sales. So we 4 5 keep an eye on that as well. 6 JUDGE GEARY: And did you ever see the cash 7 register receipts that Mr. Joudi based his summaries on? 8 I think we only requested those. MR. DUSKIN: 9 didn't maintain or keep those during the audit period, but 10 he started keeping them, I believe, after -- once the 11 audit started, they requested a period for inspection. 12 JUDGE GEARY: Would you characterize those cash 13 register receipts as source documents for the data? 14 The ones that they received after MR. DUSKIN: 15 the audit period? 16 Just the cash receipts period. JUDGE GEARY: 17 cash register receipts that Mr. Joudi --18 MR. DUSKIN: Yeah. 19 JUDGE GEARY: -- bases his summaries --20 I would also consider those as MR. DUSKIN: 2.1 source documents. It's very common in the industry that 22 they keep daily records, and that's often sufficient. 23 JUDGE GEARY: Did you ever --2.4 MR. DUSKIN: Yeah, I do recommend they keep their 25 cash register receipts. And when I told him that, he did

start keeping them.

2.4

JUDGE GEARY: Okay. All right. Those are the only questions that I have. Thank you.

MR. DUSKIN: Thank you.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you.

And Judge Kwee, do you have any questions?

JUDGE KWEE: Hi. This is Judge Kwee. I did have a couple of questions. And one was, I noticed in the CDTFA's decision it was referencing the taxpayer sells non-branded gasoline. And I was wondering if the difference between, you know, selling branded fuel versus non-branded fuel, if that has any impact on the comparison with the statewide, you know, fuel averages if non-branded fuel impacts the difference in price that would be charged, or if that makes any difference to what the price charge would be as compared to a branded fuel station.

MR. FINNEGAN: I can try to answer that, but
Mr. Joudi, certainly, you're the expert on gasoline.

Judge Kwee, with the difference between a branded and
non-branded is a branded gasoline station is subject -- or
has the ability to do gasoline futures. So what happens
in a time of increasing prices, is they have futures at a
lower price. So they're provided gasoline at prices that
were negotiated with the oil companies at the time.

When it compares to non-branded, Mr. Joudi is

subject to the spot market and that when prices rise, he pays them immediately, versus branded company that would have that ability to buy at a lower price. Also, what happens is when prices decrease, which does not happen very often, and from what I showed you on Exhibit 9, it didn't happen really in the audit, is that there's an ability to gain profit because you're buying at the spot market when prices are dropping dramatically.

2.1

2.4

everybody believes that.

In fact, some of the documents I've shown in this audit or review, is that prices dropped, like, \$0.60 in the period of two months. So Mr. Joudi would gather profit at that time. But like I mentioned earlier when prices are rising, it's much less advantageous to be an independent gasoline business.

MR. DUSKIN: I would say something on that. I would say that also the branded gasoline stations command a little bit higher price because I believe that auto -- the drivers believe that branded fuel is a little bit cleaner and safer for their vehicle. You know, not

Mr. Joudi, do you want to add to that?

Then in California we don't really have to worry about that because our regulations are very strict on gasoline. But I do believe that the brand gasoline stations are able to command a higher price in whole just

because people believe it's a better gasoline.

2.1

2.4

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you. One other question was just about the location of the gas station. I think it was mentioned that it was between, like, two highways. And I'm wondering if the primary customer of the gas station, would those be, you know, people that hop on and off the freeway, or is the primary customer locals that they see over and over again that live in Porterville? Or is that not something that's really known?

MR. JOUDI: Can I answer this question?

JUDGE KWEE: Please go ahead.

MR. JOUDI: Okay. Because I have far more people who comes to my store, they go off the freeway. From town, they go off to left field. They have to drive the freeway. And I have both customers, from freeway and from town.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you.

And I think the last question that I had was just about the markup that was calculated by CDTFA. You're estimating that -- or I guess the records are reflecting between for the 3 years as 6 to 9 percent markup over cost. It was like 6.36 to 7.79 to 9.41. And I'm just wondering with that amount of a markup, you know, after considering, you know, the sales taxes, income taxes

overhead is that -- would taxpayer be operating at a net loss at that -- if they were accepting that type of a markup? Or was that still enough to cover cost, not considering the liquor and food sales, just considering the gas sales? Was that markup causing a loss?

MR. DUSKIN: I can address that.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay.

2.1

2.4

MR. DUSKIN: I can address that. I'm doing his records when he was losing money and some months when he was even losing money in his gasoline, he was still making money. He wasn't losing money overall in the business because of those tough months of not making money in gasoline. He was able to sustain it. If you look at the whole year, you'll see he had a profit and he was able to sustain his lifestyle.

Apparently, I think in some of those years I think it was tough for him in some of those years. But it was tough, especially, I'm sure a few months when he was actually losing money in gasoline. But overall, he was making money in this business due to his convenience market.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. And --

MR. FINNEGAN: Judge Kwee, I also indicated in 2018 his gross profit just from gasoline alone was close to \$400,000. And usually, it was over \$200,000 each and

every year.

2.4

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. And yeah, I did recall that. And I think that just triggered one final question. I'm just wondering if there's any sort of advantage to having a high-volume low-markup sale in -- like, for example, like if there's a benefit paid to -- or volume discount paid if you are selling a higher volume than if you're selling a lower volume with a supplier or if there's any sort of rebate or incentive that you get for having certain thresholds met, or if that's not at all a consideration for increasing the volume of gas sales?

MR. DUSKIN: I would say that test has to be done in the business by the owner by seeing what the market will bear and seeing how many customers it brings in. And there's a point where you find out if you raise your price too high you don't get any customers. You don't make any money. And there's a point when you find out how low you have to go to draw the people in. And if drawing the people in gets more money in the convenience store, then that's a net win overall.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. So there weren't any sort of like manufacturer volume-based discounts or rebates based on the volume of the sale? That was not at all a consideration that would have been applicable?

MR. FINNEGAN: What Mr. Joudi did have though,

Judge, is he did have a card lock system. He had customers that come in that he has contract with. I believe it's Flyer. That was in the audit working papers by the district. Flyer via contract pays Mr. Joudi --

2.1

2.4

What is it? 3 percent over cost, Mr. Joudi? And oftentimes you'd be paid less than that 3 percent on gasoline. Can you expound to that as well, Mr. Joudi?

MR. JOUDI: Yes, sir. Okay. I have the contract. They call it CFN card. The CFN card contract between me and Flyer. Their customers, they come and fill up gas from my station, and they give me over my cost \$0.03 each gallon. That's all the -- that's all. And I accept that to bring people to my store to buy merchandise from the store.

That's why I accept it, but it's not enough margin for the gas \$0.03 to survive off of it. And sometimes I've been losing money in this. In this case, like losing the gas, but I'm making money inside the store. That's as we say.

MR. FINNEGAN: And the \$0.03 over a gallon of gas is 1 percent margin. So again, this is further evidence that he's keeping a low margin to be able to make the money on the retail side. And boy is he making the money on the retail side.

JUDGE KWEE: Okay. Thank you.

1 I don't have any further questions, but I believe Judge Geary might have a question. So I will turn it back 2 3 over to the other Panel members from here. Thank you. 4 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 5 Judge Geary? 6 JUDGE GEARY: Yes. Thank you. Some of the 7 questions from Judge Kwee reminded me to ask a question of Mr. Joudi. 8 Mr. Joudi, Mr. Finnegan was talking about ARCO 10 coming into the area at some point and became competition 11 for you. Is ARCO located on a freeway, at least right 12 next to the freeway on-ramp or off-ramp? 13 MR. JOUDI: Yes. In town -- both us in town, but 14 it's located on 190. I'm located on 65, like between me 15 and ARCO like not even a mile, around a mile between. 16 the reason we have to keep with ARCO, even compete with 17 ARCO -- I'm sorry -- the customers in town they go to 18 where it's the cheapest gas. That's what it is. 19 JUDGE GEARY: You are not in town, I take it? 20 MR. JOUDI: I'm sorry. 21 Is your station in town? JUDGE GEARY: 22 MR. JOUDI: Yes. Both of us are in town, but we 23 close to the freeway. 2.4 JUDGE GEARY: And which of the highways or 25 freeways that you referred to as the busier?

1	MR. JOUDI: 65.
2	JUDGE GEARY: And that's the one you're on?
3	MR. JOUDI: Yes.
4	JUDGE GEARY: And are you right at or very close
5	to an on-ramp, off-ramp?
6	MR. JOUDI: Yes. I'm like I'm next exit after
7	the ramp.
8	JUDGE GEARY: So they would exit and drive a
9	block or two to get to your station?
10	MR. JOUDI: Yes.
11	JUDGE GEARY: And is the do you know whether
12	or not the ramp
13	THE JOUDI: I'm sorry. The exit from the
14	Freeway 65 right away to my station. Like I am
15	JUDGE GEARY: Okay. Can they see anything of
16	your station, and can a driver on 65 heading is 65
17	east, west, north, south, or what?
18	MR. JOUDI: North south.
19	JUDGE GEARY: Okay. Can north or south traffic
20	on 65 see from the freeway approaching that exit that your
21	station is there from a high sign or something like that?
22	MR. JOUDI: Yes.
23	JUDGE GEARY: And is there a sign on the freeway
24	itself advertising indicating fuel available at that
25	ramp, at that exit?

MR. JOUDI: No. No.

2.4

JUDGE GEARY: All right. Those are my questions. Thank you for Mr. Bearing with, Mr. Joudi.

MR. JOUDI: Thank you.

JUDGE GEARY: Thank you, Judge Long.

JUDGE LONG: Thank you.

I just have a couple of questions regarding the price differential. I understand you're arguing,

Mr. Finnegan, that there were extremely low markups on gasoline, including occasional possible negative markups where the money was made up -- or the difference in income was made up in the mini-mart.

It looks like CDTFA's audit used a price differential of \$0.23 per gallon less than the average — the statewide average. Is your argument then is essentially that differential should be greater, that you were even further below the statewide average.

MR. FINNEGAN: What I'll argue is that you see the Department used the change of \$0.30, right. But when they did it, they split up the amount by 50 percent of credit, 50 percent cash. And credit prices after Mr. Joudi began in business were \$0.10 higher. So what you'll see in that allocation is the Department actually dropped down to \$0.23 as the differentiation between the statewide average and what Mr. Joudi's business was.

The fact he didn't have credit at that time meant that \$0.28 that you see in that schedule should have been utilized by the Department. But what I'm also indicating is that when the Department did the test for gasoline, they tested a period that was not reflective of the overall period. They took the test in the December, November, October time period where prices were dropping dramatically, and Mr. Joudi had increased margins.

2.1

2.4

And you can see that by -- in my schedule

Exhibits 12, 1 through 5, I looked at profit and loss

statements for the months of August, September, October,

November, and December. And the district principal

auditor of the Fresno district took a look at what the

periods were for the fourth quarter 2018, as well as the

first quarter of 2019. But what he saw at that point was

high margins because of that drop in pricing.

The drop in cost really allowed Mr. Joudi to gather income at that point. No other time in the audit showing you in that graft did that occur. Yet, the Department is utilizing a test on something that didn't occur during the audit.

So the short answer is we are objecting to that \$0.23 that the Department is utilizing one, because there was no credit, and it should have been applied to periods in 2015 when Mr. Joudi didn't have the ability to

differentiate between cash or credit. That only occurred in June of 2018. Hopefully that --

2.1

2.4

JUDGE LONG: Actually, I'm sorry to interrupt, but I want to just make sure that I'm clear because you've said it a couple of different ways now, and I want to make sure that I have the correct representation of your answer. You said that Mr. Joudi didn't have credit. And then also you've said that he had no way to differentiate between the credit prices. Did he not accept credit cards for a period of time, or is it just that he didn't have the ability to differentiate between pricing for credit cards throughout the audit period?

MR. FINNEGAN: In June of 2018, he bought all new pumps and bought new software and all that. I'll have Mr. Joudi describe that and what changed. But he kept gas prices the same for --

JUDGE LONG: Right. I understand, but you're not -- you're not answering any question.

MR. FINNEGAN: I apologize.

JUDGE LONG: No difference between cash and credit during 2018 or was there -- or prior to June 2018, or is there no credit during periods prior to June 2018?

MR. FINNEGAN: There was no difference in pricing.

JUDGE LONG: Okav.

1 MR. FINNEGAN: Mr. Joudi, you can answer to that 2 better than I. 3 JUDGE LONG: And is there any evidence that prior to -- within your exhibits, your 16 exhibits here, that 4 5 there's no price difference prior to June 2018? 6 MR. JOUDI: The -- okay. My only difference I 7 had, the Ruby cash register. And Ruby cash register, the old one is not qualified to do two prices for the credit 8 9 card when you're on it. 10 JUDGE LONG: Okay. 11 MR. JOUDI: With my new system, my new point of 12 sale I have to switch the credit card, different prices. But before that I couldn't do it. My point of sale was 13 14 completely like an old system. 15 JUDGE LONG: Okay. Thank you. 16 I don't have any further questions. So with that we will turn our attention to CDTFA. 17 18 CDTFA can begin when it's ready. And I believe 19 you asked for 20 minutes. So you may begin when you're 20 ready. 21 MR. SHARMA: This is Ravinder Sharma. We asked 22 for 30 minutes, but I think we will finish within 23 20 minutes. Thank you so much. /// 2.4 25 ///

1	<u>PRESENTATION</u>
2	MR. SHARMA: Appellant, a corporation, operates a
3	gasoline station with a mini-mart in Porterville,
4	California, since January 2015. The Department performed
5	and
6	THE STENOGRAPHER: Sorry. Mr. Sharma, I'm sorry
7	to interrupt.
8	Judge Long, can we go off the record for just a
9	minute or even less. I have to plug in. My computer is
10	saying it's not plugged in, and it's starting to go.
11	JUDGE LONG: Of course. We'll just take a minute
12	off the record and let us know when you are ready.
13	THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.
14	(There was a pause in the proceedings.)
15	JUDGE LONG: Looks like we are all here.
16	Ms. Alonzo, are you ready to go?
17	Okay. Mr. Sharma, I am sorry to ask, but can you
18	please start from the beginning.
19	MR. SHARMA: This is Ravinder Sharma. Sure. I
20	will do it. Thank you.
21	
22	PRESENTATION (continued)
23	MR. SHARMA: Appellant, a corporation, operates a
24	gasoline station with a mini-mart in Porterville,
25	California, since January 2015. That Department performed

an audit examination for the period of July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2018. Appellant provided limited books and records such as federal income tax returns for years 2015 to 2017 and profit and loss statements for the audit period.

2.4

However, Appellant did not provide any source documents such as purchase invoices, point-of-sale sales summary reports, or cash register tapes for the audit period. During the audit process, Appellant informed the Department that it used handwritten monthly sales reports based on cash register tapes to prepare and file quarterly sales and use tax returns. However, Appellant did not provide any cash register tapes, so the Department could not verify the accuracy of the handwritten sales reports.

Due to lack of complete and reliable books and records, the Department was unable to verify the accuracy of Appellant's reporting method. In the absence of reliable books and records, the Department used an indirect audit method to verify the accuracy of reported amounts asked to determine unreported taxable sales.

The Department reviewed profit and loss statements for 2015 to 2017 and calculated achieved markup of approximately 33 percent for mini-mart and 117 percent for deli items; Exhibit A, page 29. Based on Department's experience with similar businesses in the surrounding

areas, achieved markup was reasonable and acceptable. So the Department accepted reported amounts for mini-mart.

2.1

2.4

In a detailed review of profit and loss statements for 2015 to 2017 revealed markup of approximately 9 percent for 2015, 6 percent for 2016, and 8 percent for 2017 for gasoline; Exhibit A, page 29. Due to lack of source documentation such as cash register tapes, point-of-sale sales data, and purchase invoices, the Department could not verify the accuracy of gasoline purchases and gasoline sales. So the Department used an indirect audit method to verify the accuracy of gasoline purchases and sales.

The Department's analysis of gasoline prepaid sales tax were collected by vendors, and claimed gasoline prepaid sales tax by Appellant showed no differences for the audit period; Exhibit 8, page 53 and 54. The Department accepted claimed prepaid sales tax and used the same to determine total purchases of little more than 4.1 million gallons of gasoline for retail sales; Exhibit A, page 4, and 9,900 gallons for resale; Exhibit A, page 56 for the audit period.

Since Appellant did not provide any cash register tapes or other sales records showing sales price for gasoline during the audit period, the Department used United States Department of Energy, that's USDE, data to

estimate gasoline selling price. The Department observed selling price for gasoline for Appellant's business on 10 different days between August 6, 2018, and December 17, 2018.

2.1

And compared with average selling prices from USDE and determined that Appellant's selling price per gallon was \$0.23 lower than USDE's data; Exhibit A, page 22. The Department adjusted USDE data for a price differential of \$0.23 and used applicable sales tax rate to determine audited ex tax sale of gasoline of approximately \$11.4 million for retail sales for the audit period; Exhibit A, page 12.

Appellant reported ex tax gasoline sales of little more than \$10.3 million resulting in unreported gasoline sales of \$1.07 million for the audit period; Exhibit A, page 10. Similarly, the Department determined audited sales for resale of approximately \$273,000 for the audit period; Exhibit A, page 56. Appellant claimed total sales for resale of around \$271,000 resulting a difference of around \$2,000, which was not significant; Exhibit A, page 55. Due to immaterial differences, the Department accepted claimed sales for resale for the audit period.

Based on the above audit procedures, the

Department determined unreported gasoline sales of little

more than \$1.07 million for the audit period; Exhibit A,

page 10. As of now, Appellant has not provided any documentary evidence to show that audited gallons of gasoline purchases for the audit period are not correct.

2.1

2.4

Further, despite various requests Appellant has not provided any cash register tapes or point-of-sale data to show that audited selling price per gallon is not correct or was lower during the audit period. Appellant contends that the Department accepted a similar markup by another retailer in the same area. The Department urges the Panel to give this evidence no weight.

Revenue & Taxation Code Section 7056 prohibits the Department from divulging any information regarding retailers that are not party to this appeal. The Department examines and evaluates each retailer based on available books and records and many other factors related to that specific retailer.

Appellant's allegations regarding a retailer not party to this appeal when the Department is legally prohibited from explaining how the facts and circumstances for that retailer may be different from the facts and circumstances in the audit being appealed now. The Panel should focus solely on whether the audits of this appeal was properly performed.

Appellant contends that it sold gasoline at

1 significantly lower prices than what were used by the 2 Department. In response, the Department submits that 3 despite various requests Appellant failed to provide any books and records to support the reported amounts. 4 5 Further, Appellant did not provide any cash register tapes 6 or retail sales records to show that it sold gasoline at 7 lower prices during the audit period. 8 Based on the above, the Department has fully 9 explained the basis for the deficiency and proved that the 10 determination was reasonable based on the available books 11 and records. Further, the Department has used approved 12 audit methods to determine the deficiency. Therefore, based on the evidence presented, Department requests that 13 14 Appellant's appeal be denied. 15 This concludes my presentation, and I'm available 16 to answer any question you may have. Thank you. 17 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 18 This is Judge Long. I just want to turn to my 19 co-Panelists to see if they have any questions. 20 Judge Geary, do you have any questions? 21 Thank you, Judge Long. JUDGE GEARY: Yes. 22 I think probably Mr. Sharma, did you indicate the 23 legal basis for the prohibition concerning the

taxpayer who is not before us?

Department's discussion or disclosure of the audit of the

2.4

25

1 MR. SHARMA: This is Ravinder Sharma. Yes, it's 2 Revenue & Taxation Code 7056, prohibits the Department 3 from divulging any information regarding retailers that 4 are not party to this appeal. 5 JUDGE GEARY: Thank you. 6 MR. SHARMA: Thank you. 7 JUDGE GEARY: That's the only question I have. Thank you, Judge Long. 8 9 MR. DUSKIN: Can I ask Mr. Sharma a question? 10 JUDGE LONG: This is Judge Long. No. 11 MR. DUSKIN: Okay. 12 JUDGE LONG: You may not ask any questions of 13 CDTFA as they're not testifying. They're only presenting 14 their arguments. 15 MR. DUSKIN: All right. 16 JUDGE LONG: Judge Kwee, do you have any 17 questions for CDTFA? 18 JUDGE KWEE: I don't have any questions. I'11 19 turn it back to you, Judge Long. 20 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 21 I also do not have any questions about how the 22 audit was conducted. So we will move on to Appellant's 23 closing statement. Let me just -- took a lot of notes 2.4 here. 25 Mr. Finnegan, you requested an additional 5

minutes to make a closing statement. You may begin when you are ready.

2.4

## CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you, Judge Long. Thank you, Judge Geary, and thank you, Judge Kwee.

What Mr. Sharma had indicated, he said that the Appellant had presented no accounting records. We never received an email ever requesting anything we hadn't provided. It's good to note that the Department has a document called 414Z where they have to identify any correspondences with the taxpayer on any areas that they're asking for documents or information. For some reason the Department did not request that from this auditor. If you look at 414Z, it's literally -- it's blank. It literally says nothing. It doesn't say anything of what he's done.

The area that Mr. Sharma talks about is purchase invoices. As Mr. Duskin is well aware, he's never withheld accounting records on purchase invoices.

Mr. Sharma also indicates that they did the reconciliation of prepaid sales tax. Well, the prepaid sales tax is paid on the purchase invoices. The accounting records in the audit do the reconciliation of all purchases of gasoline.

It's disingenuous that now he says that they didn't have

accounting records for gasoline purchases. That's a falsehood. It's completely false.

2.4

The other area he's talking about is source documentation, the taxpayer presented no evidence. That's not true. The Department had bank records and you know that bank records are utilized all the time to determine what the taxable transactions are. It's part of the audit manual and something the auditor is required to look at.

Dennis, would you care to discuss that? You wrote the record requirements.

MR. DUSKIN: Yes. That's what I wanted to point out is anything the auditor asked for was presented. The only documents we couldn't present was the cash register tapes. Everything else in my records are scanned. I have a scanned invoice of every gasoline purchase invoice since he started his business long before this audit to date.

And I would have happily presented anything that he had requested. I'm not sure if I did request the purchase invoices, but I don't recall being asked about that. I don't remember being told I wasn't presenting any. I never -- I never had such a request.

MR. FINNEGAN: And if the Department would have requested it, the Department Audit Manual chapter 2, as Mr. Sharma is quite aware, requires that documentation to be identified on that 414Z. It's how the Department

corresponds so that when we get into these types of hearings, there is no he said, she said. It's indicated on the document. That has been left blank.

2.1

2.4

And it's also required that the supervisor -- the audit supervisor also reports onto that 414Z all the occurrences that happen. Now, we provided contemporaneous information on daily sales through Mr. Joudi's daily sales records. That was used to verify taxable sales, which are taxable non-gasoline sales which are 20 percent of the total overall sales and even a higher percent of his margins.

The Department is saying we didn't provide records. That's not the case. And the reason why I was forced to go to another audit -- and obviously he -- Mr. Sharma identifies 7056. The Department in its correspondences with me indicated that we have no -- actually, the way they phrased it is we do not believe that your markup or Mr. Joudi's markup is representative of the margins that we see in gasoline for your location.

That is never published, you know. I don't need to know the name of the business that has that. But for them to say, you know, you just didn't get enough of a margin. Well, what margin was I supposed to have? Is there some -- is there some approved percentage that the Department says, yeah, that's good? I found that

percentage by -- when the Department accepted another audit.

2.1

2.4

All right. You met the 9 percent in 2015. You met the 8 percent in 2016. You met the 11 percent.

That's the threshold. But my God, how do you know that?

How do you know that from the Department if they won't say, hey, this is what we expect of you?

My client did very well by keeping taxes -- or by keeping retail sales prices low. He ended up paying far more to the CDTFA at the end of the audit than he did at the beginning of it when he began business in 2015 as Mr. Sharma indicated. \$167,000 more than what he did in the beginning of this review.

So if you're looking for somebody that's not reporting the taxes, that's not how it's done. I was an auditor for 20 years. How it's done is they'll take cash and they won't deposit it. They will have lower sales. They'll purchase product without reporting that on their balance — or on their financial statements. The Department had every opportunity to look at purchases. The Department had every opportunity to look at sales.

What happened is like Dennis said. The auditor was fixated on the retail gasoline, and he said I can't believe you're this low. Well, when he added \$300,000 to each and every year of Mr. Joudi's reporting -- I'm

sales, his margin now becomes 20 percent over cost, not 6.36, not 7.91, well over 20 percent, which is unheard of in the highest poverty area county of all of California.

2.1

2.4

And it's unheard of because you're seeing social media accounts that say this guy has got the lowest prices in town. He's lower than ARCO. I presented evidence on multiple occasions to specific occasions to the Department saying, look, he's \$0.06 to \$0.08 less on unleaded sales. And I bet today he's even less on that.

So I would urge this, Judges, to take an overall look on this and say, hey, he did quite well for himself. He did everything a business owner should. He's increased his gross profit. He's paying more taxes. He's earning good money on that, and that's how he did it. He kept his prices low. He attracted more customers. More customers went into the business. They bought liquor, beer, wine, soda, all of the other things he sold other than gasoline.

He still made money on gasoline. Do not lose sight of that. I have shown, on the P&Ls that in the 2018 period alone, he had \$400,000 of gross profit from gasoline. That was not the only area he was making money on though. And I -- you know, I appreciate the Department. You can't penalize somebody just on saying,

all right, we're going to come up with a number and here 1 you go. And I think that's exactly what the Fresno 2 3 district has done in this matter. 4 Thank you. 5 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. I do want to actually follow up with CDTFA about 6 7 something that Mr. Finnegan said. Regarding the bank statements, my understanding is that no bank analysis was 8 9 done, and I'm looking at Exhibit A, page 2, and it does 10 indicate bank deposits -- or bank statements were 11 provided. Am I correct in my understanding of this 12 case -- or with respect to the bank statements? 13 MR. SHARMA: This is Ravinder Sharma. That's 14 correct. No bank statements were provided and no analyses 15 were done. I'm just saying based on the audit working 16 papers and reviewing everything available to us from the 17 very beginning to the audit process, appeals process, and 18 as of now. 19 JUDGE LONG: Okay. Thank you. I think I 20 understand your position. 21 With that, I just want to make sure. 22 co-Panelists have any final questions? 23 Judge Geary, do you have any questions? 2.4 JUDGE GEARY: Actually, I do for Mr. Finnegan.

Mr. Finnegan, is there somewhere in Appellant's

25

evidence and analysis of what you think the correct result is, or do you believe the correct result is that there should be no deficiency determined for the period at issue?

2.1

2.4

MR. FINNEGAN: Absolutely, we feel that there should be no deficiency. We believe everything that was shown on the financial statements was accurate prepared by Dennis Duskin. Dennis has been in the business for 30 years. He knows what to look for on areas where taxpayers are not reporting properly. He's testified that he's received no indication of when he was preparing the tax returns, be it the sales tax returns, his federal income tax return, any of these areas.

And the other critical area that I think is important is the auditor utilized the Schedule 12A-1C,

Judge Geary. And he allocated cost back -- or these retail sales prices back for three years. Well, you know, he used the wrong number. He's indicating that there was credit charged. That wasn't the case. Mr. Joudi has testified that it was one single retail sale price. It was no \$0.10 greater price in any points in the audit.

Yet, this is a form that CDTFA uses.

And I would also state that in that other audit, if you so choose to look at it, you will see that the Department utilized this other methodology to ascertain

what the gasoline prices were. So the fact that they had all the source document, that they had all the books and records, the Department still used this methodology to dictate how much they owed.

2.1

2.4

And, in fact, they issued a determination that was petitioned. And the Department looked at that and said, okay, you're right. We're going to accept this. But, again, this methodology is used all the time by the district, and it doesn't matter if you have all the books and records and all the source documents.

This is a go to that they do. He just doesn't want to say that. You know, it happened on the subsequent audit of my client, and he had books and records. Yet, they still used this methodology. So I would imagine this is unique to the Fresno district.

JUDGE GEARY: Thank you, Mr. Finnegan.

I have one question also for Mr. Sharma.

Mr. Sharma, is there a 414Z in the Department's -- in CDTFA's evidence?

MR. SHARMA: This is Ravinder Sharma. That is correct. There's a 414Z, and there are not that many comments because originally when auditors try to contact the Appellant or representative, the audit was requested to be transferred to a different district. So based on my review of this, I mean, the audit working papers, the

1 auditors might have requested this information when they 2 talked to the representative of Appellant because of the 3 audit being transferred from one district to another district. That's why some of the 414Z comments may be 4 5 missing. But, again, 414Z comments are just like not 6 everything that's part of the audit. Yes, to answer your 7 question, 414Z is attached. 8 JUDGE GEARY: Thank you. 9 Those are my only questions, Judge Long. 10 you. Judge Geary, I just wanted to add 11 MR. PARKER: 12 that the 414Z is Exhibit A, page 73. Just so it's in the 13 record and easy to find. 14 JUDGE LONG: Thank you. 15 Judge Kwee, any final questions before we 16 conclude? 17 JUDGE KWEE: This is Judge Kwee. I don't have 18 any questions. Thank you. 19 JUDGE LONG: Okay. Then I believe we are ready 20 to conclude our hearing. 2.1 Thank you everyone for coming in today. This 22 case is submitted on Thursday, April 20th, 2022 [sic] the 23 Judges will meet and decide your case later on, and we

days after the record is closed.

will send you a written opinion of our decision within 100

2.4

25

```
Today's hearing in the Appeal of Sham Gas
 1
      Express, Inc., is now adjourned.
 2
 3
                And this concludes our hearings for the day.
      Thank you.
 4
 5
                (Proceedings adjourned at 11:42 a.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## 1 HEARING REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, Ernalyn M. Alonzo, Hearing Reporter in and for 3 the State of California, do hereby certify: 4 5 That the foregoing transcript of proceedings was 6 taken before me at the time and place set forth, that the 7 testimony and proceedings were reported stenographically 8 by me and later transcribed by computer-aided 9 transcription under my direction and supervision, that the 10 foregoing is a true record of the testimony and 11 proceedings taken at that time. 12 I further certify that I am in no way interested 13 in the outcome of said action. 14 I have hereunto subscribed my name this 8th day 15 of May, 2023. 16 17 18 19 ERNALYN M. ALONZO 20 HEARING REPORTER 21 2.2 23 2.4 25